

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-23 are pending. Claims 17-20 have been allowed. Claims 1, 4, 11, and 21 have been amended and claims 2, 24, and 25 have been canceled. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments presented in this paper raise no new issues requiring further searching and/or consideration by the Examiner, as all of the amendments are based on features taken from the allowable claims.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 3, 8-14, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious in view of Sharma-Chheda combination. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite features from allowable claim 4. Specifically, claim 1 recites “wherein each of the first and second sectors of the gateway base station comprise an overlap area of the first and base stations.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Sharma and Chheda patents, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite “a first base station controls cell A and a second base station controls cell B wherein each of the α and β sectors comprise an overlap area of the first and second base stations.” These features are also taken from allowable claim 4. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Serial No. 09/964,537
Reply to Office Action dated July 25, 2006

Docket No. K-0261

Claim 21 was amended to recite the features of allowable claim 25. It is respectfully submitted that claim 21 and its dependent claims are therefore allowable.

Claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Charma-Chheda-Jalloul combination. Applicants traverse this rejection on grounds that claims 6, 7, 15, and 16 depend from one of the previously discussed independent claims which have been amended to recite allowable subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/964,537
Reply to Office Action dated July 25, 2006

Docket No. K-0261

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y. J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701
Date: OCTOBER 25, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

DYK/SWN:knh

\\\Fk4\Documents\2016\2016-874\101114.doc